

REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed January 14, 2005.

Claims 1, 3, 33-36, and 39 are herein amended.

Claims 13-32 are withdrawn.

Claim 2 is canceled.

Claims 1, 3-12, and 33-43 are pending.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-10 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In order to expedite the claims toward allowance, claims 1, 33, and 39 have been amended as follows:

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 2.

Claim 2 has been canceled.

Claim 33 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 2.

Claim 39 has been amended to include limitations similar to the limitations of claim 2.

Art Rejections

Claims 1, 33, and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woods (USPN 5,956,039) in view of Matsui (USPN 6,437,778).

Claims 11-12, 32-38, and 40-43 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of the prior art of record.

Claim 1 as amended recites:

A method for managing a scene graph, the method comprising:
determining a current location for a viewpoint;
determining a current locality threshold based on at least the current location of the viewpoint;
determining which portions of the scene graph are relevant to the current locality threshold;
loading into a local memory those portions of the scene graph that are relevant within the current locality threshold; [[and]]
replacing portions of the scene graph that are not relevant within the current locality threshold with one or more pointers, wherein the pointers indicate where the replaced portions may be loaded from if the replaced portions are needed;
determining a predicted future locality threshold; and
loading into the local memory those portions of the scene graph that are relevant within the predicted future locality threshold, wherein said replacing is performed only on portions of the scene graph that are not relevant within (i) the current locality threshold and (ii) the predicted future locality threshold.

The Examiner states in item 13 that “Applicant’s particular system and associated methods in the environment of managing graphical scenes is loading into the local memory those portions of the scene graph that are relevant within the predicted future locality threshold, in combination with the limitation of wherein said replacing is performed only on portions of the scene graph that are not relevant within (i) the current locality threshold and (ii) the predicted future locality thresholdwas not disclosed by, would not have been obvious over, nor would have been fairly suggested by the prior art of record or that encountered in searching of the prior art”.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1 and its dependent claims are non-obvious and patentably distinguished over Woods and Matsui for at least the reasons given above.

Applicant further submits that the independent claim 33 has also been amended with the limitations “determine a predicted future locality threshold; and load into the local memory those portions of the scene graph that are relevant within the predicted future locality threshold, wherein said replace is performed only on portions of the scene graph that are not relevant within (i) the current locality threshold and (ii) the predicted future locality threshold”.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 33 and its dependent claims are also non-obvious and patentably distinguished over Woods and Matsui for at least the reasons given above in support of claim 1.

Applicant further submits that the independent claim 39 has also been amended with the limitations “determining a predicted future locality threshold; and loading into the local memory those portions of the scene graph that are relevant within the predicted future locality threshold, wherein said redirecting is performed only on pointers in the scene graph that are not relevant to the current locality threshold and the predicted future locality threshold”.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 39 and its dependent claims are also non-obvious and patentably distinguished over Woods and Matsui for at least the reasons given above in support of claim 1.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits the application is now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5181-68801/JCH.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

☒ Return Receipt Postcard

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey C. Hood
Reg. No. 35,198
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: April 14, 2005 JCH/JWC